



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.												
10/697,412	10/30/2003	Ching Jen Chen	3303-23	7240												
7590 Michael K. Dixon Akerman Senterfitt 4th Floor 222 Lakeview Avenue West Palm Beach, FL 33401		11/06/2007	<table border="1"><tr><td colspan="2">EXAMINER</td></tr><tr><td colspan="2">FRANTZ, JESSICA L</td></tr><tr><td>ART UNIT</td><td>PAPER NUMBER</td></tr><tr><td>3746</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>MAIL DATE</td><td>DELIVERY MODE</td></tr><tr><td>11/06/2007</td><td>PAPER</td></tr></table>		EXAMINER		FRANTZ, JESSICA L		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	3746		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	11/06/2007	PAPER
EXAMINER																
FRANTZ, JESSICA L																
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER															
3746																
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE															
11/06/2007	PAPER															

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/697,412

Applicant(s)

CHEN ET AL.

Examiner

Jessica L. Frantz

Art Unit

3746

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 September 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 and 31-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 5-9, 13, 14, 18-23, 32 and 33 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 10-12, 15-17, 24-29 and 31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 30 October 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### DETAILED ACTION

1. This Action is in response to the Amendment received 9/14/2007. Currently, Claims 1-4, 10-12, 15-17, 24-29 and 31 are pending.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-4, 15-17 and 27-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Burns et al. 6,379,929 in view of Unger et al. 2002/0144738 and further in view of Kohlhaas et al. 6,454,547. Burns teaches a micropump device made of a fully monolithic body formed from a single material, specifically silicone, has the advantage that no bonding is necessary (Burns column 30, lines 38-41). However, Burns fails to teach the specific number of layers used or the total thickness of pump. However, such limitations are merely optimum ranges and are known in the prior art as is evidenced by Unger who also teaches a micropump with the specified thickness (see Unger paragraphs [0163]-[0171]) and layer number requirements (see Unger paragraph [0012]). Furthermore, it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation. In re Swain et al., 33 CCPA (Patents) 1250, 156 F.2d 239, 70 USPQ 412; Minnesota Mining and Mfg. Co. v. Coe, 69 App. D.C. 217, 99 F.2d 986, 38 USPQ 213; Allen et al. v. Coe, 77 App. D.C. 324, 135 F.2d 11, 57 USPQ 136.

However, both Burns and Unger fail to teach the following claimed limitations that are taught by Kohlhaas: a method of pumping fluids (column 3, lines 6-9) where the pump includes a pumping chamber (not labeled see figure 2) wherein said pumping chamber includes an inlet 12 for drawing fluid therein and an outlet 13 for expelling said fluid out of said chamber, and structure 17, 18 for mechanically urging said fluid from said inlet 12 to said outlet 13 wherein the pumping chamber includes at least one rotatable disk 17 in fluid communication with said fluid and said structure 17, 18 for mechanically urging comprising said rotatable disk 17, wherein the rotatable disk 17 comprises as least one spiral shaped protrusion 18 extending from and concentric with the disk 17.

Furthermore, Kohlhaas teaches that the pump body (not labeled see figure 2) comprises a base layer and side walls (also not labeled but clearly shown in figure 2) forming the pumping chamber. Kohlhaas teaches this structure for the purpose of creating a pump with the smallest possible dimensions which can be produced particularly cost-effectively (see Kohlhaas column 1, lines 35-38). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified the pump structure of Burns and Unger with the pump structure of Kohlhaas in order to create a pump with the smallest possible dimensions that can be produced particularly cost-effectively (see Kohlhaas column 1, lines 35-38).

4. Claims 10-12, 24-26 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Burns et al. 6,379,929 in view of Unger 2002/0144738 in view of Kohlhaas et al. 6,454,547 and further in view of Romero et al. 5,955,801. The modified invention of Burns in view of Unger in view of Kohlhaas teaches the invention

Art Unit: 3746

substantially as claimed and is discussed above but fails to teach the following claimed limitations that are taught by Romero: an electrostatic comb drive 18, 18' for rotating a rotatable disk 17 with at least one gear 16 in contact with both the electrostatic comb drive 18, 18' and rotatable disk 17 where the one gear 16 comprises a torque amplification gear train (as shown in figure 2) for the purpose of providing a constant rotation rate output power to a micromechanism (see column 2, lines 12-14). In regards to the specific claimed 12:1 torque amplification, it is held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation. In re Swain et al., 33 CCPA (Patents) 1250, 156 F.2d 239, 70 USPQ 412; Minnesota Mining and Mfg. Co. v. Coe, 69 App. D.C. 217, 99 F.2d 986, 38 USPQ 213; Allen et al. v. Coe, 77 App. D.C. 324, 135 F.2d 11, 57 USPQ 136. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have provided the electrostatic comb drive of Romero to the modified invention of Burns in view Unger in view of Kohlhaas for the purpose of providing a constant rotation rate output power to a micromechanism (see Romero column 2, lines 12-14).

### ***Response to Arguments***

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection necessitated by Applicant's amendment.

### ***Conclusion***

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

Art Unit: 3746

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jessica L. Frantz whose telephone number is 571-272-5822. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 8:30a.m. - 5:00p.m. E.S.T..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Devon Kramer can be reached on 571-272-7118. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3746

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

*Josica Trnka*  
JF

DEVONC 10/11/07  
PATENT EXAMINER

*Devon Phan*  
11/11/07